REMARKS

In response to the current Office Action, please consider the following remarks. The Specification and Claims 7, 11, 18, and 20 have been amended. Thus, claims 1-27 are currently pending in this Application. Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration of the application as amended.

The Rejections Under 35 USC 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-25 and 27 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,457,476 (Jenson) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,877,759 (Bauer). The Examiner states that Jenson discloses a portable, hand held housing personal organizer and Bauer discloses an interface containing multiple calendars. The Examiner further rejected claim 26 as being unpatentable over Jenson and Bauer , and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,621,458 (Mann). The Examiner states that although neither Jenson nor Bauer disclose a "calendar of a foreign country," Mann teaches the creation of a custom calendar, which may include a foreign calendar. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for reasons set forth below.

The Cited Art

Jenson generally discloses a method of modifying data in a portable, hand held housing personal organizer, and more particularly discloses. Jenson teaches a method of moving temporal-based entries such as appointments within and/or between temporal based functions such as a scheduler, to do-list and a note function. However, Jenson's personal organizer does

not have the capability of displaying multiple calendars. Jenson, in fact, handles a single calendar on a PDA, as disclosed by Applicant as prior art.

Bauer discloses a personal computer allowing the display of multiple calendars stored on a network servers. Bauer's teaching requires extensive computer hardware, such as the circuitry and components within a laptop or desktop computer, and a large separate monitor for a desktop computer or fold-up monitor for a laptop computer, coupled to a network of personal computers sharing a calendar database stored on a network server. Therefore, Bauer teaches the use of a network server system, which allows multiple calendars to be displayed, as also disclosed by Applicants as prior art.

Mann discloses a calendar controlled docking apparatus. Mann does not disclose either a PDA or a networked computer system but rather a calendar controlled docking system for electronic devices capable of combining calendars. Mann does not display any calendars, let alone multiple calendars.

The Cited Art Distinguished

Independent claims 7, 11, 18, 20 and 22, as amended, include the limitation of storing various calendars within a portable data storage module in separate databases. Support for the added limitations is found in the application as filed; see for example page 12, line 9 of the specification.

Claim 1 is believed to be patentable over the cited art. The claimed invention teaches a portable data storage module comprising a portable, hand-held housing, an input device situated on a top face of the housing and adapted for allowing input of data, a display situated on the top face of the housing and adapted for depicting data, memory situated in the interior space of the housing for storing a plurality of calendars each including a plurality of scheduled matters, and a controller situated in the interior space of the housing and connected between the input device,

the display, and the memory, the controller suitable for simultaneously depicting a plurality of the calendars on the display.

The combination of Jenson and Bauer clearly does not teach, hint or suggest the combination of claim 1. Jenson fails to teach a portable storage module for simultaneously depicting multiple calendars in a single display on a top face of a PDA or a controller suitable for simultaneously depicting a plurality of the calendars on the display. Jenson's teaching is directed to a portable personal digital assistant, which in the past has been thought of as personal to the user and his personal needs, and therefore needs only to display a single calendar.

Bauer discloses a user interface in the form of a browser in which the schedules of various individuals are compared side by side (Col. 14, lines 19-20). However, there is no teaching in Bauer that multiple calendars could be displayed on a PDA and no disclosure on how this could be accomplished. Neither Jenson nor Bauer teach or suggest Applicant's claimed invention. Bauer clearly teaches away from the present invention because the method of saving the multiple calendars in Bauer requires a central storage system such as an Internet or intranet server (Fig. 1, Col. 2, lines 59-61). In contrast, the present invention teaches providing a plurality of calendar databases each including a calendar having a plurality of scheduled matters. The method of the present invention is therefore very different from the methods of Bauer. For example a user of a PDA based on the present invention can display and manipulate the multiple calendars on his PDA without accessing the network since all the calendars are being displayed stored on his PDA's internal memory. This is because the data in PDA is personal, i.e. "PDA centric" as opposed to data stored on a network server, which is "network centric". That is Bauer's teaching requires the user to access a network such as the Internet or an Intranet to access the various servers where each individual's calendar may be stored on in order to retrieve these multiple calendars before he can display them side by side on his local machine.

Applicant therefore respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable over the cited art and respectfully requests its rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 7, 11, 18 and 20 are also believed patentable over cited art including Jenson in view of Bauer. Jenson does not teach or suggest a method for displaying multiple calendars on a portable personal organizer such as a PDA with limited circuitry and a small display on the top face of a display. Bauer discloses multiple calendars stored on a central server and accessed using a web browser through the Internet (Fig. 1, Col. 2, lines 1-4 and 59-61). In contrast, the present invention teaches the combination of storing various calendars within a portable data storage module in separate databases; depicting at least one calendar on a display of a portable data storage module, the display situated on a top face of the portable data storage module; depicting a plurality of icons each corresponding to increments of time selected from the group of increments of time including hours, days, and weeks; allowing the selection of one of the icons; and dividing the at least one calendar into increments of time corresponding to one of the icons that is selected.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits the claimed invention as claimed in amended claim 7, 11, 18, 20 are patentably distinguishable from Bauer in view of Jenson and respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection.

The invention as claimed in amended claim 22 is believed to be patentable over Jenson in view of Bauer. The present invention teaches storage of each calendar and associated matters in separate databases and a common database for storing a plurality of data sets each corresponding to the calendar of one of the calendar databases (page 12, lines 6-14). The common database allows the scheduled matters to be shared among the calendar databases (page 12, lines 22-23). No combination of Bauer and Jenson teaches or suggests these limitations. Furthermore, as discussed above, unlike Bauer or Jenson, the claimed invention teaches displaying and manipulating a plurality of calendars on a display situated on the top face of a PDA. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits the claimed invention as claimed in amended claim 22 is patentably distinguishable from Bauer in view of Jenson and respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection.

Jenson in view of Bauer does not teach the invention as claimed in patentably distinguishable claims 1, 7, 11, 18, 20 and 22 of the present application. Dependent claims 2-6, 8-10, 12-17, 19, 21 and 23-27 directly or indirectly depend from and contain all the patentably

distinguishing limitations of allowable independent claims 1, 7, 11, 18, 20 and 22, respectively. Applicant traverses the rejection of claim 26 with regards to the Mann reference, but the rejection is rendered moot by the allowability of the independent claims. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 2-6, 8-10, 12-17, 19, 21 and 23-27 are in position to overcome this rejection and respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that pending claims 1-27 are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejections and objections. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
HICKMAN COLEMAN & HUGHES, LLP

Paul Hickman
Reg. 28,516

P. O. Box 52037
Palo Alto, CA 94303-0746
650-470-7430